

Attendance of the February 16, 2005 GMTF Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)

Name	Agency
Adams, Hon. Steve	City of Riverside
Baldwin, Hon. Harry	City of San Gabriel
Bhuyan, Shefa	Caltrans District 8
Bone, Hon. Lou	City of Tustin
Bower, Nancy	California Highway Patrol
Camph, Don	Aldaron
Capelle, Joanna	SCRRA
Dale, Hon. Lawrence	City of Barstow
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
DiCamillo, LaDonna	BNSF Railway
Erney, Tim	Wilbur Smith Associates
Fetty, George	George Fetty and Associates
Flickinger, Hon. Bonnie	City of Moreno Valley
Grace, Jon	LACMTA
Gurule, Hon. Frank	City of Cudahy
Guss, Ron	California Trucking Association
Hart, Arno	Wilbur Smith Associates
Herrera, Hon. Carol	San Gabriel Valley COG
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
Lai, Sue	Port of Los Angeles
Lee, Francis	Caltrans District 7
Marcus, Richard	OCTA
Maun, Lena	Port of Los Angeles
Morrissey, Sam	Wilbur Smith Associates
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Rodriguez, Dilara	Caltrans District 7
San Augustin, Liberty	Caltrans District 7
Schiermeyer, Carl	RCTC
Staba, Gail	Moffett and Nichol
Wiggins, Stephanie	RCTC
Young, Lisa	Wilbur Smith Associates
SCAG Staff	
Faranesh, Zahi	
Pfeffer, Nancy	
Vasishth, Ashwani	
Wong, Philbert	

GOODS MOVEMENT TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2005

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Gene Daniels, City of Paramount, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes. Self introductions were made.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the January 19, 2005 Minutes

Motion to approve the January 19, 2005 Goods Movement Task Force minutes was seconded and accepted with no objections.

4.0 ACTION ITEMS

4.1 Ranking criteria for alternatives to be used in the Inland Empire Mainline Rail Study

George Fetty, George Fetty and Associates, presented this item. To date, the operations alternatives have been formulated, the simulation analysis is 90% complete, the rail infrastructure cost estimation is 85% complete, and the grade crossing analysis is 75% complete. Furthermore, the emissions and population analyses are in progress. After all analysis has been completed, the alternatives will be ranked and a final report will be produced.

In developing alternative train routing options relative to the status quo, the goals are to save money and improve performance by: reducing the train count through the worst bottlenecks (e.g. Riverside-Colton), avoiding the most costly line expansions (e.g. UP Pomona-Riverside line), separating Metrolink from heavy UP freight traffic, and routing the freights where most environmentally friendly, while maintaining service to all terminals.

There are two alternatives that will be analyzed. Alternative 1 would concentrate UP freights on the L.A. subdivision west of Pomona and on the Alhambra subdivision east of Pomona. If this were done, there are two variations for routing Metrolink trains. The first, Alternative 1a, would maintain the status quo routing of Metrolink Riverside trains. The second, Alternative 1b, would reroute Metrolink Riverside trains via the Alhambra subdivision west of Pomona. Alternative 2 would concentrate UP freights on the Alhambra subdivision. In the status quo routing, about 2/3 of UP freight trains travel on the UP L.A. subdivision line, and 1/3 travel on the Alhambra subdivision.

The proposed evaluation criteria for these alternatives consists of four components: present value of total capital expenditures through 2025 for rail infrastructure and grade separations (40%), train-weighted population exposure (the number of people living within 500 feet of tracks multiplied by the number of through freight trains in that segment of track) (40%), residual vehicle-hours of delay (10%), and total emissions (10%).

The scores will be developed as follows: for each criteria, the alternatives will be ranked, with the worst scoring alternative set at 1.0. For example, for the criteria of total emissions, alternative 1 could be ranked 1.0, alternative 1a could be ranked 0.80, etc. This rank will be multiplied by the weight assigned to that criteria (total emissions would be 0.1). This will be done in each category and the scores will be added up for each alternative, and the lower the score the better.

Ms. Dilara Rodriguez, Caltrans, asked how the consulting team determined the weights assigned to each category. Mr. Fetty stated that the weight assigned to the present value of total capital expenditures is a reflection of the scarcity of resources available for infrastructure investment. He also stated that it is important to continue to work and communicate with all stakeholders in the region including Alameda Corridor East (ACE), Metrolink, UP, and BNSF.

Ms. Sharon Neely, ACE, asked if these evaluation criteria applied to the rail lines west of Colton crossing. She stated that the cities along the Alameda Corridor East have already adopted evaluation criteria and would not want to revisit and redevelop evaluation criteria for prioritizing infrastructure investments.

Recommended Action: The action of the Task Force is to collect additional comments and defer this item to the March GMTF meeting.

5.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Goods Movement Program Update

Nancy Pfeffer, SCAG, presented this item and briefed the Task Force on the following items:

Goods Movement Policy Paper – the paper has been finalized, posted on the SCAG website, and was sent to Secretary McPeak on Monday, February 14. One change was noted, which is that the paper now asks for a coordinated environmental review among the state and federal agencies to the greatest extent possible.

Executive Stakeholders Roundtable – This event was held on February 7 at SCAG and was attended by approximately 50 representatives of public and private sector organizations. Three main points resulted from the discussion: 1) Doing nothing is not an acceptable option; 2) we need to act collectively and not individually; and 3) public funding will not be sufficient to support infrastructure needs. SCAG plans to continue the dialogue between the public and private sectors and hopes to convene additional roundtable meetings in coming months.

Nancy Pfeffer attended a Charette in Washington D.C. on the development of a course on Freight and the Environment. The charette included representatives from MPOs, DOTs, EPA, FHWA, etc. The consensus of the group was that air quality and land use are top priorities, with environmental justice ranking third.

Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan –the RFP for this project is scheduled to be released towards the end of February.

Ms. Pfeffer noted that SCAG staff are in the process of reviewing GMTF membership and clarifying the mission and structure of the committee.

Upcoming events – A town hall meeting on the health impacts of goods movement and the ports will be held in Long Beach on February 25-26. Also, the Center for International Trade and Transportation (CITT) annual town hall meeting will be held on March 10 at Cal State Long Beach.

5.2 Update on Air Quality Mitigation of Goods Movement

Ashwani Vasishth, SCAG, presented this item. This work, which is an extension of the Goods Movement Policy paper produced for Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing Sunne McPeak, is intended to be a preliminary evaluation that would allow for the growth of goods

movement while also mitigating the negative environmental, particularly air quality, impacts.

In conducting this analysis, emissions from ocean going vessels, heavy duty trucks, locomotives, cargo handling equipment, and harbor crafts were evaluated. Initial findings indicate that it is possible to attain federal clean air standards while also accommodating port growth if the region fully implements an aggressive combination of strategies.

Ocean going vessels (OGV) are the largest and fastest growing port-related emissions source. Currently, OGVs account for $\frac{1}{2}$ of port related emissions, and this could grow to $\frac{3}{4}$ by 2030. On the other hand, strategies to reduce OGV emissions are available, including cold-ironing, alternative fuels, and engine modernization. Collectively, if implemented, these strategies have the potential to reduce OGV emissions by $\frac{3}{4}$ by 2030.

Heavy duty trucks are the second largest port-related emission source, contributing $\frac{1}{4}$ of total port-related emissions. The primary strategy for reducing these emissions is to accelerate replacement or retrofitting of old trucks.

Locomotives are the third largest port-related emissions source, contributing $\frac{1}{7}$ of total port-related emissions. With respect to locomotives, there is a need for more stringent federal rail emissions standards as well as modernization of trains.

Cargo handling equipment contribute about $\frac{1}{10}$ of port-related emissions. Though emissions of cargo handling equipment are currently significantly being mitigated, this process could be accelerated through earlier implementation of the use of alternative fuels, diesel oxidation catalysts, and particulate filters.

Harbor crafts also contribute to port-related emissions, and the strategies to reduce these emissions are similar to that of cargo handling equipment: the use of alternative fuels, diesel oxidation catalysts, and particulate filters.

Staff is examining potential implementation strategies for these emissions reduction programs, including sea to land emissions credits and differential pricing that strongly incentivizes the use of cleaner technologies.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

This item was included as part of item 5.2.

6.0 COMMENT PERIOD

Councilmember Gene Daniels would like to get additional participation from elected officials and would like to take that request to the Regional Council and TCC.

7.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular GMTF meeting will be:
Wednesday, March 16, 2005
9:30am-11:00am
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.